

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA

11                  MARI DANIEL, individually and as the  
12 Personal Representative of the Estate of  
13 MELVIN DANIEL, and as Guardian for the  
14 minor children, M.A. DANIEL, DOB  
15 6/13/90, & B.A. DANIEL, DOB 6/28/93, and  
16 MARI DANIEL, as the Personal  
17 Representative of the Estate of FRED  
18 RAMISKEY,

19                  Plaintiffs,

20                  v.

21                  THE COLEMAN COMPANY, INC., a  
22 Delaware corporation,

23                  Defendant.

24                  CASE NO. 06-5706 KLS

25                  MINUTE ENTRY REGARDING  
26 COORDINATED MOTIONS AND  
27 DISCOVERY

28                  On October 15, 2007 the undersigned entered an order directing the parties to meet and confer (Dkt. #63) and set a due date of November 2, 2007. Each party timely filed their response to the Court's order. (Dkt. #67 - 69).

29                  The directive by this Court was made with regard to two concerns. The first was the obvious filing  
30 of duplicative motions in the *Ongpituk* case and the *Daniel* case. As the Court noted, this duplication  
31 "does not make good use of counsel's time or judicial resources." At this time it appears, based on the  
32 responses, that there likely will be no more duplicative motions filed in the two cases. Should that occur,  
33 the undersigned will *sua sponte* make a determination as to how the duplicate motion in this case will be

1 | resolved.

2        The second concern was with regard to coordinated use of discovery. More specifically, the Court  
3 was concerned about duplicating discovery for both cases, such as unnecessarily taking a deposition of the  
4 same witness twice. The responses filed on behalf of the parties appear to be more concerned with the use  
5 at trial of depositions which have already been taken. That is an evidentiary concern which the  
6 undersigned did not intend to be resolved in a coordinated plan.

7       Further, based in the information made available to the court and in light of the discovery cut off  
8 date in *Ongpituk*, there appears to be no need, at this time, for the type of order contemplated by the  
9 Court.

10 DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2007.

Ben Thomson

**Karen L. Strombom  
United States Magistrate Judge**